UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

NATHAN WILLIAMS,

Petitioner,

٧.

BRIAN E. WILLIAMS, SR., et al.,

Respondents.

Case No. 3:17-cv-00365-HDM-WGC

ORDER

In this habeas corpus action, on August 6, 2018, the Court ruled on the respondents' motion to dismiss, granting it in part and denying it in part, dismissing certain of the claims of the *pro se* petitioner, Nathan Williams, and ordering the respondents to file an answer responding to the remaining claims. See Order entered August 6, 2018 (ECF No. 26). After a 45-day extension of time (ECF No. 28) and a 33-day extension of time (ECF No. 31), Respondents' answer was due on January 22, 2019.

On January 22, 2019, Respondents filed a motion for an extension of time (ECF No. 32), requesting a third extension of time, this one 2 days, to January 24, 2019. Respondents then filed their answer on January 24, 2019 (ECF No. 34). Respondents' counsel states that the extension of time was necessary because of unexpected time away from her office. The Court finds that Respondents' motion for extension of time is made in good faith and not solely for the purpose of delay, and that there is good cause for the extension of time requested.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Respondents' Motion for Enlargement of Time (ECF No. 32) is **GRANTED**. Respondents' answer (ECF No. 34) will be treated as timely filed. Under the scheduling order in this case (ECF No. 28), Petitioner's reply to the answer is due on March 25, 2019.

DATED THIS <u>25th</u> day of <u>January</u>, 2019.

HOWARD D. McKIBBEN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Howard DMEKiller